

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 09 2007

1

REMARKS

2

This is a response to the Office action dated September 11, 2006. Applicant amends the specification and claims 1-8 and cancels claims 9-12 and 15-30. Claims 1-8 and 31-38 are presented for examination. Applicant requests reexamination and reconsideration of application.

3

On pages 2-4 of the Office action, the examiner states claims 1-12 and 15-30 were examined and the marked up specification is a complete reply to the 37 CFR 1.105 requirement, but is not persuaded that Project 2000 fails to inherently anticipate the form route manager as claimed.

4

Applicant understands the Office accepts (1) the revised drawings submitted along with the previous amendment, (2) applicant's response to the informalities raised against claims 1-30, and (3) applicant's response to the 35 USC 112 rejections raised against claims 1-30, since the Office action fails to maintain the objections and rejections.

5

On page 4 of the Office action, the examiner objects the specification does not provide an antecedent basis for the claims as required by 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP 608.01(o). The examiner suggests adding the sequencer limitations in the specification.

6

In response, applicant adds a paragraph with the sequencer limitations. Support for this amendment is found, e.g., in claim 5 of the grandparent application filed on July 28, 1997 (see below). Applicant replaces paragraph [0143] which is supported by Figure 25.

7

On pages 4-19 of the Office action, the examiner rejects claims 1-12 and 15-30 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by "Sams Teach Yourself Microsoft Project 2000 in 24 Hours" (Project 2000). The examiner asserts since the software described in Project 2000 necessarily functions as claimed, Project 2000 inherently anticipates the claims.

8

The examiner has not established a prima facie case that Project 2000 anticipates or renders obvious claims 1-12 and 15-30. The examiner fails to cite literature to support his interpretation of Project 2000. Certainly, MAPI (messaging application programming interface) does not necessitate the functions and Project 2000 does not describe the back end of MS Exchange and MS Project. Instead, Project 2000 purports to teach the

1 user interface of Project 2000. The fact the inherency case extrapolates the back end
2 functions from the user interface suggests the claimed functions are only a possibility
3 rather than necessity in Project 2000. Applicant submits the examiner should not rest on
4 a possibility, but search for any literature that expressly describes the functions of MS
5 Exchange and MS Project 2000 so patentability can be safely assessed.

6 Separately, applicant submits amended claims 1-8 find support in the grandparent US
7 application filed on July 28, 1997. As a reminder, this application is a continuation-in-
8 part of US Application No. 09/417,280, now US Patent No. 6,442,594, filed on October
9 13, 1999, which is a divisional of US Application No. 08/901,539, now US Patent No.
10 5,978,836, filed on July 28, 1997, which are all incorporated by reference. More
11 specifically, amended claims 1-8 find support, for example, in Figure 5 and column 4,
12 line 64 through col. 7, line 17 and Figure 25 and column 18, line 10 through col. 19,
13 line 18 of US Patent No. 5,978,836.

14 Because the second page of the copy of Project 2000 states: "First Printing: April 2000"
15 and "Copyright © 2000 Sams Publishing," Project 2000 cannot anticipate or make
16 obvious amended claims 1-8.

17
18 Applicant adds new claims 31-38 that substantially correspond to original claims 1-8
19 and are patentable as discussed above with respect to original claims 1-12 and 15-30.

20 Please email reply to schedule an interview to discuss this amendment.

21
22 Respectfully Submitted,

23 Robert Moll

24 Robert Moll

25 Reg. No. 33,741

26 1173 Saint Charles Court

27 Los Altos, CA 94024

28 Tel: 650-567-9153

29 Fax: 650-567-9183

30 Email: rgmoll@patentplanet.com